



THE NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Reviewing Stand

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

Illinois U Library

How Does Humor Affect Our Lives?

A radio discussion over WGN and the Mutual Broadcasting System

DR. RUDOLPH DREIKURS

Professor of Psychiatry, Chicago Medical School; Lecturer in Education,
Northwestern University

WALTER B. SCOTT, Jr.

Associate Professor of Dramatic Literature, School of Speech,
Northwestern University

ED SOVOLA

Columnist, Indianapolis Times; Winner, Ernie Pyle Scholarship Award
Author, Monday Follows Tuesday

Moderator: JAMES H. McBURNEY

Dean, The School of Speech, Northwestern University

Broadcast continuously since 1934 by Northwestern University



THE REVIEWING STAND is a weekly radio forum presented by Northwestern University. The program was first broadcast by Station WGN, Chicago, October 14, 1934. It has been on the air continuously since that time, originating in the WGN studios, and, since 1935, carried by stations of the Mutual Broadcasting System. **THE REVIEWING STAND** presents members of the Northwestern University faculty and distinguished guests from business, government, education, and the press in round table discussions of contemporary problems—the questions that are in the news. The program is under the direction of James H. McBurney, Dean of the School of Speech, Northwestern University, and Miss Myrtle Stahl, Director of Educational Programs, WGN, Chicago.

The Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, published weekly beginning May 2, 1948, by the Offices of the Director of Radio (Public Relations), Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Evanston, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1875. Subscription price, \$1.00 for 16 weeks, \$2.00 for 32 weeks, \$2.50 for one year. Single copies, ten cents.

How Does Humor Affect Our Lives?

MR. MCBURNEY: We have with us today, Ed Sovola, columnist on the *Indianapolis Times*, and winner of the first Ernie Pyle Scholarship award. I have just finished reading your book, Ed, *Monday Follows Tuesday*. What's the purpose of this book?

MR. SOVOLA: We thought we had a vehicle of humor that might be distributed on a larger scale than it was when I was working for the *Times*. I am still working, but the purpose was to distribute the humor through book form.

MR. MCBURNEY: Have most of the stories you tell in the book appeared in the *Times*?

MR. SOVOLA: Yes, they have. They have been reworked and reshaped a little bit and improved, I hope.

'Monday Follows Tuesday'

MR. MCBURNEY: Where do you get that title, "Monday Follows Tuesday?"

MR. SOVOLA: In my type of business, daily columns, when I am through with Monday, I have to go into Tuesday and when I am through with Tuesday, there is Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, and here comes Monday. You see, Tuesday does follow Monday in my type of work.

MR. MCBURNEY: I trust this learned panel will accept the explanation. I might ask you about your experience in leaf counting. I have heard of leaf raking, but how about the business of leaf counting? Do you recommend it as an avocation?

MR. SOVOLA: Certainly! When you are through counting the leaves on the tree, you are the only man that knows how many leaves are on the tree. No one asked me when I got through counting the leaves on a Norway maple, but I went out and asked a man if he would like to know too.

I was in the position of knowing a vital fact. Of course, he didn't want to know. Nevertheless, if he did, I would know.

MR. MCBURNEY: I have a good notion to ask you here and now, how many leaves that Norway maple had.

MR. SOVOLA: 354,643.

MR. MCBURNEY: That will be recorded for posterity. May I now present Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, Professor of Psychiatry at the Chicago Medical School, and lecturer in education at Northwestern University. Doctor, why is it that the psychiatrist is made the butt of so many stories and jokes?

DR. DREIKURS: That is not so easy to say. There are a number of theories.

MR. MCBURNEY: Does it bother you at all?

Psychiatry 'Jokes'

DR. DREIKURS: No, I enjoy it. It is always good to be the center of attention whether it is pleasant or unpleasant, but the jokes are pleasant anyhow. There is a Freudian theory of unconscious control of humor. These jokes, I think you might expect, are probably an expression of their love for a psychiatrist—after all, the psychiatrist should be the object of love—or hatred of the psychiatrist. There might be other explanations. People are, right now, very much concerned about psychiatry because they wonder how much they themselves might need it. There is the little joke, one of the oldest jokes on psychiatry which shows very well what to expect from a psychiatrist, the old joke about how psychiatrists greet each other when they meet, "You are fine, how am I?" A distortion of the normal person's approach.

MR. MCBURNEY: Our third speaker is Dr. Walter Scott, Professor of Dramatic Literature, and a colleague of mine in the School of Speech at

Northwestern University. Walter, do you find humor useful as a teacher?

MR. SCOTT: All too useful, sometimes, Mac. A little humor in the classroom is a good thing now and then, to relieve the tension, if there is any tension, or more likely to lessen the boredom, but the teacher has a kind of captive audience and they have a stake in his jokes, good or bad. That can be a very bad thing for the teacher.

MR. McBURNEY: Gentlemen, what is the effect of this humor? What does it do for the individual? Sovola, does it help us in our lives?

Releases Tension

MR. SOVOLA: In my experiences, in some of the things I have done, when people laugh, they forget momentarily what their troubles are, they try to participate, they enter into the thing. I am sure that humor, whatever form it takes, except the vicious type, is relaxing and makes a person forget. It helps him to do his work. He releases his tension and goes on.

MR. McBURNEY: What kind of humor are you interested in, particularly?

MR. SOVOLA: I am interested in the visual type of humor, in audience participation. For example, in the trash can episode that I had: a trash can is a very familiar sight, and clean up, fix up, and paint up week is a familiar sight, so I took the worm's-eye view. I climbed in the trash can and watched the debris come in. When an individual put something in, I would say, "thank you," completely surprising him. When he found out there was a man in there, he would laugh, and we would chat. It was just a little twist, a reverse on something quite familiar. Also, when I sat as a dummy in a store window, people know dummies and for a human being to go into a window and pose as a dummy creates a humorous situation. There is no pretense to completely fool an individual, but he imagines himself in the situation, and tries to make me laugh, and he knows he can eventually. That is a type of humor, vaudeville, slap-stick.

MR. SCOTT: Did anybody try to climb in the trash can with you, Ed?

MR. SOVOLA: There isn't too much room in a trash can.

MR. McBURNEY: Scott, has anyone tried to classify humor?

MR. SCOTT: About 18 million people have written books on humor and comedy. They all have their wrinkles and gimmicks and angles and try to break humor or comedy into categories of humor and wit, distinguish various kinds of humor from various other kinds of humor, and so on down the line. If you run through the literature on the subject, you are going to be overwhelmed by the enormous humorless categorizing of humor.

'Integrates Group'

MR. McBURNEY: Sovola suggested that humor does relieve tension, worry, inhibitions. As a psychiatrist, do you find that to be true?

DR. DREIKURS: There is no doubt about it. I think it is only one aspect, however. There are more dynamics involved. You might investigate a little bit here. Sovola pointed out one fact of humor—it integrates a group. It is contagious. When people can laugh together, they have a stronger feeling of cohesion and even individual relationship. If you can make somebody laugh, he is closer to you, he warms up to you. For instance, if I am giving a talk to an audience of adults or students, if I cannot make them laugh, they are distant, but when they laugh, they are responsive and they become a unit and I am a part of it. Laughter and humor have the purpose of being an emotional integration with a group. It seems to me that humor establishes a different relationship to certain objects with which we are concerned and that is why humor is so important in our lives. Instead of being down, instead of letting something get us down, we elevate ourselves above a situation, something frightening or embarrassing, something we are concerned about, and if we can laugh about it, we free ourselves from the impression that it is dangerous. We bring ourselves from an inferior position to a

superior position in regard to subjects as well as people.

MR. SCOTT: Could you say humor has a kind of magic function in protecting us in this way against the whammies and threats and dangers of life?

DR. DREIKURS: I could accept the term "magic," if you mean something automatic, something without awareness. You say "the magic word"; it means when you touch something that has a far-reaching effect—in that sense I could accept the term "magic." There is nothing magical about it if we understand what is going on.

Humor As a Therapy

MR. McBURNEY: I am interested in this. As a psychiatrist, do you think humor has a therapeutic value? Is it good for a patient's health? Do you use it in therapy?

DR. DREIKURS: Very much so. For the purpose of working with the patient, if he can't understand the point I have to make, I say something humorous so he can see the situation. The humor relieves him of his defenses and he becomes free. At the same time, if the patient can learn to laugh, if he sees the humor of his problems, of his behavior, he is above it. He can reorient himself.

MR. SOVOLA: Taking a different stand, I have had people come out and tell me and write me letters saying they have appreciated some of the stunts I have done. It is a little bit on the exhibitionist side, but they appreciate that sort of thing where they can laugh either by seeing me or reading in the newspapers. That is what we hope to do in the book we are trying to distribute. It will give the readers a chance to enjoy little situations like that.

MR. McBURNEY: Scott, do you think there is any difference between the kind of humor that appeals to men and women?

MR. SCOTT: Well, there again, to be a little pedantic about it, since that is my role today, the literature is divided on the subject. Women and

men probably, I would guess, do see jokes differently. I know my wife, a very loyal person ordinarily, never laughs as heartily at some of my jokes as I do. That is the only experimenting I have done on this particular matter, and I had better not commit myself any further.

MR. McBURNEY: What do you think about that, Dr. Dreikurs?

DR. DREIKURS: It seems obvious, whatever their group characteristics, humor would be affected by it. I wonder how far, for instance, women really can enjoy jokes about women as much as men do, and I wonder if the opposite, jokes made about the man's superiority, if the men can really enjoy it the same as women. There is a difference in their interests and how they look at life.

Humor of Adolescents

MR. McBURNEY: There are obvious differences, it seems to me, between the kind of humor that appeals to adolescents and adults.

DR. DREIKURS: Right. Yes, that is a very interesting point because there is this terrific cleavage between the adult society and children. There is a war going on . . .

MR. SCOTT: Like the war between the sexes.

DR. DREIKURS: More intense, not viciously but we find among the youngsters, the teen-agers, the use of humor as a defense against adult society. You will find the boys and their boisterous horse-play with utter disregard of the norms of society; you find among the girls, the giggling which makes them a group by themselves, and establishes them in not only a distant superior position, but they are not submitting themselves to the norm of society.

MR. SCOTT: Adults tend to be kindly and tolerant in their jokes about children, wouldn't you say? In fact, possibly pushing it a bit too far in these days, when being a youth or being a teen-ager has become as much a racket as everything else in our society.

DR. DREIKURS: Adults are more and more afraid of the jokes and perhaps are not so light and tolerant as we have seen in the past.

MR. SCOTT: We like to kid ourselves.

MR. McBURNEY: We are talking here about the effect of humor, Scott. Do you see any larger social value in a good sense of humor?

MR. SCOTT: Of course, humor is essentially a social thing.

MR. McBURNEY: Doesn't it have anti-social effects at times?

MR. SCOTT: Indeed it does. Not from the point of view of the person telling the joke or engaged in the humor, but we are all familiar with the lowest and crudest sort which is directed against anything that is different from us, merely because it is different; a different accent, a different race, a profession that is regarded commonly as funny like psychiatry or teaching, whatever it may be; that kind of humor working on that level is engaged a good deal of the time in a kind of stupid protection of some vested interest. Laughter in that instance is taken by the laugher to be final and perfect and divinely ordained.

Anti-Social Humor

DR. DREIKURS: There is a distinction between social and anti-social humor. Thomas Hobbes pointed out that laughter is often at the expense of others. It is a sudden glory about the downfall of others or of one's own excellence. Bergson pointed out that laughter might be a means of keeping a social discipline, of getting people in line out of fear of ridicule. We can distinguish here, benevolent laughter and friendly laughter which might have the same result, but at the same time, we find a very cold, thrashing form of humor which puts the other one down. We can distinguish in the classroom situation, for instance, whether the teacher is able to create a humor which makes the people laugh with each other or laugh against one another.

MR. SCOTT: In any case though, it all the more probably involves a de-

fense of some kind of order, either real or desired, on the part of the laugher. He is, by protecting his own notion of what is desired or right or normal order, at the same time attacking or running down or triumphing over what he takes to be an enemy of that kind of order.

DR. DREIKURS: I want to point out there is some evidence that the first laughter of man was a victory triumph. Then it became a triumph in the duel of wits, and often a triumph in solving a problem, a sense of superiority in battle. This is an important element in the tendency to laugh.

MR. SCOTT: And it continues in the elaborate and sophisticated humor of a highly civilized society.

MR. McBURNEY: When you stood on the main street in Indianapolis and let somebody throw pies in your face, did you get victory cries?

'Throw Away Inhibitions'

MR. SOVOLA: I got a lot of inhibitions thrown away. People told me when they got through throwing a pie, it was something they wanted to do for a long, long time, but I didn't hear any victory cries from them. I do know this, there was no hesitancy of any kind for them to come up and throw the pies when they were offered to them. There was one charming young lady who threw the pie—

MR. McBURNEY: Did she hit you?

MR. SOVOLA: Yes. But when I said, "May I reciprocate?" then she didn't want to do that. I don't know, she didn't have a victory cry either.

MR. McBURNEY: Do any people resent these stunts of yours?

MR. SOVOLA: I haven't had any resentment.

MR. SCOTT: No letters to the paper denouncing . . .

MR. SOVOLA: I don't pick anything that would be harmful. It is innocent . . .

MR. SCOTT: Any solid citizen thinking it beneath the dignity of Indianapolis?

MR. SOVOLA: I make myself the butt of everything.

MR. McBURNEY: I would enjoy throwing a pie in your face, Ed, but I can think of a lot of other people I would prefer to hit in the face.

MR. SCOTT: Who forgot to bring the pies this morning? [Laughter]

Group Expression

DR. DREIKURS: There is another interesting element, and again that has something to do with the organization of group feelings. In this humor, you get a whole group of people who together can dare to express or to do things which individually they wouldn't dare to do. There you have the basis for the jokes on the Scotchman, for example. The whole group enjoys expressing itself on an attitude toward a group, a unit of people.

MR. McBURNEY: What you have been suggesting, Dr. Dreikurs, is a theory of humor. Would you make that explicit?

DR. DREIKURS: I will have to repeat what I have said. It is an effort of people to deal with some problem which embarrasses them, where they are apprehensive or concerned; it is an effort to get them out of the inferior position to a superior position. When we look at the humor of the situation, then we are not afraid. You can deal with it, you free yourself from it. It is not only, as you said, Mr. Sovola, free from someone or free from the tension, but free from something that creates the tension.

MR. McBURNEY: I should think humor might have an enormous social significance. We are certainly living in a time when we are confronted with all sorts of fears, and tensions of all kinds.

DR. DREIKURS: You are right. Probably that is the reason why we make such a point that people should have a sense of humor. Anybody who doesn't have it is socially inadequate, and it is in line with the American tendency to put so much constant pressure on personality. One has to have it to get along. A sense of humor is one of the means of getting

along and to remain somewhat poised in dealing with it. People are supposed to have a sense of humor. It has become almost a social obligation.

MR. SOVOLA: Are we going to be concerned about humor growing to such an extent we will all be laughing? Don't you suppose that might create a little anti-social effect?

MR. SCOTT: We are only going to be bitterly defending a sense of humor.

'Defend Sense of Humor'

MR. McBURNEY: Why do people defend their sense of humor?

MR. SCOTT: I don't have any scientific answers for it. It is something I have observed. I feel from reading the newspapers and listening to the radio and so on, that you can reflect on a man's character, insult his wife, sneer at his ancestors, disparage his children, kick his dog and he might turn a charitable smile on you, but tell him he has no sense of humor and out comes the knife, the hatchet, the gun or whatever.

DR. DREIKURS: He has no personality or poise.

MR. SOVOLA: Shoot him with a knife.

MR. SCOTT: If we announced on this program a flat statement that 90% of our listeners were moral hypocrites, we would probably get some sharp retorts. If we announced that 90% of our listeners, representative of the American public, had no sense of humor, this building would be deluged with indignant mail and personal visits with horsewhips.

MR. McBURNEY: You are not disposed to make such an announcement?

MR. SCOTT: If you make it worth my while.

MR. McBURNEY: In your theory of humor, Doctor, how do you account for the effect of the sudden and unexpected, quite apart from the matter of elevating oneself above the object or situation? Don't people laugh at the sudden and unexpected?

DR. DREIKURS: It has been pointed out in literature that suddenness and

the unexpected play an important part. Everybody who is a comedian instinctively knows it and he is constantly doing the unexpected and getting laughter. Gag writers are people who always think of the formulation which is most unexpected. In this sense, I would say that the unexpected has two possibilities in response. It is embarrassing and one doesn't know what to do with it, or it gets immediate laughter.

The Unexpected

MR. SOVOLA: In cartoons, the unexpected is capitalized upon, wouldn't you say? For example, we are working a little bit on cartoons. We have a submarine snorkel and right behind it a TV antennae; it is a matter of the sudden association. Virgil Partch has that sudden approach. You look at the thing and you see the humor in it, like a helmet with a plumber's pipe on it; we don't use that sort of thing here in cleaning our clothes.

DR. DREIKURS: May I make a practical suggestion for our audience on how to increase their humor effectively. If they stop when they want to say something and say it in an unusual way, in an unexpected way, you get the best results. Mr. Scott, if we present our material just as the students expect it, they don't listen. When you present it differently than expected, it gets their attention.

MR. SOVOLA: Commercial ads spelled backwards?

MR. SCOTT: Think what it would do to our audience if they take you seriously. We will have a nation of neurotic angle hunters, or gimmick hunters.

DR. DREIKURS: Everyone tries a different approach, winning attention by laughter, by trying to put everything in a different way than the other one would expect. In dealing with children, it is a most important approach.

MR. McBURNEY: When you suggest as a theory of humor that humor is a means of elevating oneself above an object or individual, wouldn't a lot of humor be sadistic?

DR. DREIKURS: It could be. As long as we feel with the other one and as long as we are not hostile, this elevation can be in a benign form. It doesn't do any harm. When we are hostile, then our humor will be a bad thing and often damaging and sadistic.

Expression of Hostility?

MR. McBURNEY: You laugh at other people's misfortunes, such as the crude thing of slipping on a banana peeling and falling on your chin. That will bring a laugh.

DR. DREIKURS: I am glad you pointed that out. That is a very important point. That is not an expression of hidden hostility or meanness or sadism. It is the response to the unexpected, and I know many people feel very guilty when an accident happens and they laugh and they feel very badly. They are not bad. They are struck by the unexpected where they see the funny angle. It is not necessarily an expression of hostility.

MR. SOVOLA: How would you explain this: I have received down in my State, suggestions from my readers to go over Niagara Falls, in an umbrella for example, or similar stunt like that. Is that a sadistic approach? Do they want to get rid of me?

DR. DREIKURS: I don't know.

MR. SCOTT: I'll think about it.

DR. DREIKURS: They may be trying to test you out as to how far you would go in your desire to be unusual.

MR. SOVOLA: I almost drowned testing a ball point pen.

MR. SCOTT: Mac, I was wondering a minute ago how you could slip on a banana peel and fall on your chin.

MR. McBURNEY: That might be executed.

MR. SOVOLA: That's the sudden approach.

MR. McBURNEY: Do you think American humor has any special characteristics?

MR. SCOTT: Well, I suppose it must have. Again, there is a good deal of

ponderous writing and speculating about the subject of what these characteristics are. I wouldn't try to dish that out at this particular moment.

DR. DREIKURS: I would like to say something because I had experience, you see, myself coming from Europe and at present with friends in America. Very often my European friends don't see anything funny in what Americans think is funny, and vice versa. I couldn't clarify it. It seems to me that there is much more slapstick and horseplay here which Europeans don't find funny, and there is more brutality in the European jokes which Americans don't find funny. It seems to me that perhaps there is something in the cultural development. Mr. Scott, in private conversation, pointed out to me we have some slapstick in Europe's history. That is true with Tyl Eulenspiegel and Rabelais, but the time they lived was a little bit more primitive and happy-go-lucky. Now times have become serious. This kind of humor has disappeared. We now wonder if Americans feel the seriousness of life. This form of humor might disappear

as we see the reaction to television and to this kind of slapstick humor.

MR. SOVOLA: Some of the slapstick doesn't go over in Europe. The slapstick that would go over with a bang in Indianapolis fell flat in London. They don't quite see it. It is a matter of education. We have been educated to the slapstick by Milton Berle, Bob Hope, and all of that, and I don't think they have been educated in Europe.

DR. DREIKURS: Humor expresses itself in group thinking. As groups change, the kind of humor changes.

MR. McBURNEY: Are Americans getting more sophisticated in their humor?

MR. SCOTT: Well, sometimes I like to think so, but now and then there is a relapse.

MR. SOVOLA: Like *Monday Follows Tuesday*.

MR. SCOTT: That is a good relapse.

MR. SOVOLA: Thank you very much.

ANNOUNCER: I am sorry to interrupt, but our time is up.





Suggested Reading

Compiled by William Huff,
and M. Helen Perkins, Reference Department,
Deering Library, Northwestern University.



BERGSON, HENRI. *Laughter; an Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*. New York, Macmillan, 1911.

One of the most famous of all studies of comedy, by a distinguished French philosopher.

EASTMAN, MAX. *Enjoyment of Laughter*. New York, Simon Schuster, 1936.

A well-known American work, somewhat thin on the theoretical side, but full of amusing examples.

EVANS, BERGEN. *The Natural History of Nonsense*. New York, Knopf, 1946.

"Essays on some of mankind's superstitions and delusions . . ."

FEIBLEMAN, JAMES. *In Praise of Comedy: A Study in Its Theory and Practice*. New York, Macmillan, 1936.

A work by an American professor of philosophy with (like everyone else) his own axe to grind; chiefly useful for its survey of the history of comedy and its comments on various classical and modern theories of comedy.

FREUD, SIGMUND. *Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious*. New York, Moffat, Yard, 1916.

The best-known psychoanalytical theory of wit, humor, etc.; its conclusions are highly debatable, but it remains an important and stimulating work.

LEACOCK, STEPHEN. *Humor: Its Theory and Technique*. Toronto, Dodd, Mead, 1935.

A discussion of humor as "the kindly contemplation of the incongruities of life," by a once immensely popular contemporary humorist.

LUDOVICI, ANTHONY. *The Secret of Laughter*. London, Constable, 1921.

An interesting attempt to relate laughter to aggressive tendencies.

RAPP, ALBERT. *The Origins of Wit and Humor*. New York, Dutton, 1951.

A very recent and quite lively discussion, which develops the proposition that "the single source from which all modern forms of wit and humor have developed is the roar of triumph in an ancient jungle duel." Excellent bibliography.

SPENCER, HERBERT. "The Physiology of Laughter" in *Illustrations of Universal Progress*. New York, Appleton, 1872.

American Journal of Sociology 56:569-74, May, '51. "Conflict and Control Functions of Humor." R. M. STEPHENSON.

Analysis of the jokes concerned with social and economic differences, as used in anthologies of humor, reveal that they function as control mechanisms, emphasizing common values and minimizing conflicts.

American Sociological Review, 11:710-15, Dec., '46. "Humor as a Technique in Race Conflict." J. H. BURMA.

Describes instances in which humor was used to gain a temporary advantage in race relations.

American Sociological Review 15:88-94, Feb., '50. "A Content Analysis of Intergroup Humor." M. L. BARRON.

A well-documented article describing the effect of humor used in various ways and comparing the stereotypes appearing in the jokes of different races and nationalities.

Christian Century 67:297, Mar. 8, '50. "We Are Not Amused." S. STLYITES.

The author suggests that the progress of society can be measured by the stock jokes it no longer finds amusing.

Journal of General Psychology 36:207-19, Apr., '47. "Toward an Eclectic and Multilateral Theory of Laughter and Humor." A. RAPP.

A review of the more acceptable theories on the origin of wit and humor, with an attempt at an integrated hypothesis concerning them.

Journal of Personality 15:283-91, June, '47. "Validation of Personality Factors in Humor." L. B. LUBORSKY and R. B. CATTELL.

The first of a series of articles reporting on a research project in the psychology of humor.

Journal of Social Psychology 30:81-96, Aug., '49. "Phylogenetic Theory of Wit and Humor." A. RAPP.

An investigation of the development and relation of ridicule, humor, puns, jokes and riddles.

Modern Language Journal 35:199-203, Mar., '51. "My Uncle Mendel and Eddie Cantor." P. L. ROSENTHAL.

The success of the Jewish comedian is shown to be an understanding sympathy for mankind, gained subconsciously from racial background.

Nation 171:12, July 1, '50. "Beside the Point." J. W. KRUTCH.

The Nation's dramatic critic discusses American wit and concludes that its unique combination of spaciousness and cheerful cynicism is something only this society, based on freedom, could have produced.

Personalist 27:413-24, Oct., '46, "Humor at a Time Like This." J. W. BUCKHAM.

An appreciation of humor throughout the ages and the need for its continuance, by a formerly prominent theologian.



Have You Read These Issues
of the

Northwestern Reviewing Stand?

List of all available issues on request

VOLUME XV

15. Who Should Be Drafted?
17. Pay As You Go or Deficit Financing?
18. Accidents—Childhood's Greatest Health Hazard.
19. Can We Curb Subversives Without Losing Our Freedoms?
20. Do Rockets and Jets Mean a New Era in-Air Travel?
21. Has Christmas Lost Its Religious Significance?
22. Is the United Nations the World's Best Hope for Peace in 1951?
23. How Should Christians Look at War?
24. The Function of Criticism in a National Emergency.
25. America's Role in Southeast Asia.
26. What Should the University Stand For?

VOLUME XVI

1. The Author and Reader in Time of Crisis.
2. The Alternatives in American Foreign Policy.
4. The Small Investor: His Problems and Opportunities.
5. What Are the Social Responsibilities of Scientists?
6. Latin America in the World Crisis.
7. Do We Face Critical Shortages?
8. Population and Food Pressure in the Orient.
9. What Fools These Mortals Be.
10. How Much Can We Learn from History?

11. The Role of the Artist in a Technological Society.
12. Should College Students Be Drafted?
13. Is World War III Inevitable?
14. Are We Emotionally Prepared for Today's World?
15. Why Music?
16. The Struggle for Oil in the Middle East.
17. How Far Should We Go with Credit Controls?
18. Who Should Drive Automobiles?
20. Does Advertising Provide A Better Way of Life?
21. Can We Prevent Alcoholism?
22. Can We Stop the Traffic in Narcotics?
23. Teen-Agers Face Their Problems?
24. What Does the American Heritage Mean?
25. Are We Headed for Moral Bankruptcy?
26. Problems of a Changing Africa.

VOLUME XVII

1. What Are Other Nations Saying About Us?
2. How Does Color Affect Our Lives?
3. Do We Treat Our Convicts Right?
4. The Truth About Hormones.
5. What Will the Japanese Peace Treaty Mean?
6. How Does Freedom of Information Affect You?
7. Do We Still Face a Housing Shortage?
8. Are We Winning the War of Words?
9. What Do the Small Colleges Face?

THE REVIEWING STAND

Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

- ☐ I enclose \$1 for a 16-week subscription
☐ I enclose \$2 for a 32-week subscription
☐ I enclose \$2.50 for a 52-week subscription
 (Single copies are available at 10 cents each)

Name

Address

City State